

JUL 09 2007

571-273-8962 MS303010.01

PTOL-413A (08-06)
Approved for use through 03/31/2007. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/607,194

Examiner: Joshua D. Crabtree

First Named Applicant: Mark J. Radcliffe

Art Unit: 3714

Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Lance R. Sadler

(2) Joshua D. Crabtree

(3)

(4)

Proposed Date of Interview: July 19, 2007

Proposed Time: 3:00 EST (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic(2) ☐ Personal(3) ☐ Video ConferenceExhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES☐ NO

If yes, provide brief description:

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

Please see attached.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

/Lance R. Sadler/

Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

Lance R. Sadler

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

38,605

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Interview Addendum
Serial No. 10/607,194

During the proposed interview, applicant would like to discuss the following issues. All of the claims stand rejected as being anticipated by the reference to Charlesworth. Applicant disagrees that Charlesworth anticipates the claims.

Charlesworth discloses a data structure for annotating data files within the database. Annotation data takes a particular form using a phoneme and a word lattice which allows searching of data files responsive to a user's input query.

Taking claim 1 for example, such claim recites, in pertinent part, identifying, based on the user request, a preferred language and a preferred sub language for displaying a lyric set associated with an audio file. The office argues that Charlesworth discloses this feature in paragraph 0076. This excerpt of Charlesworth simply describes the notion that a user can speak words that are then utilized as annotation data for a data file. This paragraph does state that the speaker's language, action, dialect and phonetics set may be included in header information in the data structure. However, this subject matter is very different from, and is not to be confused with the notion of identifying a preferred language and sub language for displaying a lyric set. First, there is no mention in Charlesworth whatsoever of a lyric set. Second, there being no mention of a lyric set it is virtually impossible for Charlesworth to disclose the notion of identifying a preferred language and sub language for displaying such nonexistent lyric set.

Further, this claim recites searching a list of lyric sets to determine if one is available in the preferred language and the preferred sub language, and automatically selecting an alternate lyric set based on a hierarchical list of language priorities. Charlesworth is completely devoid of any such subject matter. The office cites to paragraph 0038 for the subject matter. However, this paragraph simply discloses the notion of using phoneme and word lattice annotation data to conduct a search using word data in a database. This paragraph simply does not describe, or suggest in any way, searching a list of lyric sets to determine whether the lyric set is available in a preferred language and sub language, and automatically selecting an alternative lyric set based on a hierarchical list of language priorities. This subject matter is simply missing from Charlesworth.

Applicant would like to discuss this and other differences in the Charlesworth reference as they bear upon the office's rejections.